UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,253	07/22/2003	Lowell L. Winger	03-0781 1496.00317	7358
24319 I SLI OGIC CI	7590 05/04/2007 ORPORATION		EXAM	INER
1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 MILPITAS, CA 95035			RAO, ANAND SHASHIKANT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WILL 11 A3, CA 93033			2621	
	•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	05/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/624,253	WINGER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Andy S. Rao	2621			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed  n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This  3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  Application Papers  9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access	vn from consideration.  r election requirement.	Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11). The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Djected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal I 6)  Other:	Pate			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Amendment

- 1. Applicant's arguments filed with respect to previously pending claims 1-20, and newly added claims 21-24 as filed on 2/5/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 2. Claims 1-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Prakasam.
- 3. The Applicant presents one substantive argument contending the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Prakasam, and further puts this argument in support of newly added claims 21-24. However, after a careful consideration of the arguments presented, and further scrutiny of the Prakasam application (US 2004/0268329 application hereinafter referred to as the Prakasam '329 application) and the provisional application #60/474,080 (hereinafter referred to as the Prakasam '080 application), the Examiner must respectfully disagree for the reasons that follow and maintain the grounds of rejection for reasons that follow, and further relies upon the Prakasam '329 application as the basis for the grounds of rejection concerning the newly added claims 21-24.

After establishing the effective date of the `329 application as being based on the provisional `080 application (Amendment of 2/5/07: page 16, lines 8-20), the Applicants argue that the Examiner cannot rely upon the date of the Prakasam `080 application because the material of the Prakasam `329 application is not properly supported in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph requirements, and in particularly cites the Examiner's reliance upon figure 6B of the Prakasam `329 application which the Applicants argue is not supported by the Prakasam `080 application (Amendment of 2/5/07: page 17, lines 1-12). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Prakasam `329 application goes into more depth in the explanation of

various features of the Prakasam '080 application, but in fact, all the material of the Prakasam '329 application is supported by the Prakasam '080 application. For the particular instance of the information of figure 6B of the Prakasam '329 application, it is noted that this is directed towards the method for reference data management and context selection (Prakasam '329 application: paragraph [011], lines 1-10), and that this information finds support from the provisional application (Prakasam '080 application: paragraphs [0072]-[0080]). Many of the paragraphs match word for word (Prakasam '329 application: paragraphs [0061]-[0080] correspond to paragraphs [0042]-[0060] in the Prakasam '080 application). This is just one of the many instances of matching information. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains Prakasam '329 application remains a valid piece of prior art.

A detailed rejection addressing the newly added claims follows below.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Application/Control Number: 10/624,253

Art Unit: 2621

ļ

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Prakasam.

Regarding claims 21-24, Prakasam discloses wherein said common slice comprises one or more macroblocks encoded (PCM) (Prakasam '329 application: figure 5) using arithmetic entropy coding (Prakasam '329 application: paragraph [0057], lines 1-13) and one or more macroblocks encoded using pulse code modulation (Prakasam '329 application: paragraph [0101], lines 1-8), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 23, Prakasam disclose wherein said demodulator is further configured to pulse code demodulate said second signal in a first mode and pass said second signal in a second mode (Prakasam '329 application: paragraph [0101], lines 1-9), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 24, Prakasam discloses wherein said second signal comprises pulse code modulated (PCM) data (Prakasam '329 application: paragraph [0101], lines 1-9), said third signal comprises arithmetic entropy coded (AC) data and generating said bitstream comprises selected either said pulse code modulated data or said arithmetic entropy coded data for each macroblock of said common slice (Prakasam '329 application: paragraph [0057], lines 1-13), as in the claim.

Application/Control Number: 10/624,253

Art Unit: 2621

## Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action against newly added claims 21-24. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy S. Rao whose telephone number is (571)-272-7337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571)-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andy S. Rao Primary Examiner Art Unit 2621

asr April 30, 2007